ORIGINAL



1

3

4

5

6

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATIO

² COMMISSIONERS

GARY PIERCE - Chairman BOB STUMP

SANDRA D. KENNEDY

PAUL NEWMAN BRENDA BURNS AZ CORP COMMERCE DOCKETED

2012 JUL 24 PM 1 30 JUL **24 2012**

DOCKETED BY

M

7 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY,

LLC FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING TO INSTALL A WATER LINE FROM THE WELL ON

TIEMAN TO WELL NO. 1 ON TOWERS.

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF

10 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING TO

11 PURCHASE THE WELL NO. 4 SITE AND THE COMPANY VEHICLE.

12 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY,

13 LLC FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING FOR AN 8,000-GALLON HYDRO-PNEUMATIC TANK.

14 IN THE MATTER OF THE RATE APPLICATION OF MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER

15 COMPANY, LLC.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0204

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0205

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0206

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0207

PROCEDURAL ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

On May 31, 2012, Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC ("Montezuma") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") the following: In Docket No. W-04254A-12-0204, an application for approval of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promises to pay Rask Construction ("Rask") the sum of \$68,592 with interest for Rask's installation of a water line from the well on Tieman to Well No. 1 on Towers ("Rask Financing"); in Docket No. W-04254A-12-0205, an application for approval of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promises to pay Patricia Olsen the sum of \$21,377 with interest for the purchase of the Well No. 4 site and a company vehicle ("Olsen Site and Vehicle Financing"); in Docket No. W-04254A-12-0206, an application for approval of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promises to pay Sergei Arias the sum of \$15,000 with interest for the purchase of an 8,000-gallon hydro-pneumatic tank to provide additional water storage to Montezuma's system ("Arias Tank Financing"); and in Docket No. W-04254A-12-0207, an application for a rate increase ("Rate Application").

1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7

On June 7, 2012, John E. Dougherty, III filed, in each of the dockets referenced above, a Motion to Intervene ("Motion"), in which Mr. Dougherty requested intervention, requested that the dockets be consolidated, and asserted that an evidentiary hearing was necessary for the four dockets. No responses to Mr. Dougherty's Motion were filed. Thus, on June 25, 2012, a Procedural Order was issued in each of the four dockets granting Mr. Dougherty intervention and requiring Montezuma and the Commission's Utilities Division ("Staff") to file in each of the four dockets, by July 16, 2012, a response to Mr. Dougherty's request for consolidation and assertion that a hearing must be held. The Procedural Orders further required Montezuma, in its responses, to identify who would be serving as Montezuma's representative in each matter.

On July 16, 2012, in each docket, Montezuma filed a response opposing an evidentiary hearing for the financing dockets as unnecessary and opposing consolidation of the four dockets. Montezuma did not identify its representative other than through the signature of Patricia Olsen on each document.

On July 16, 2012, in each docket, Staff filed a response supporting consolidation of the four dockets and taking no position on whether an evidentiary hearing should be held for the dockets. Staff stated that a hearing is not required for the Rate Application due to Montezuma's being smaller than a Class C utility but that Staff would not oppose holding an evidentiary hearing.

Montezuma's financial position must be established and considered for the Commission to make a decision as to each of the four applications. Considering each of Montezuma's applications in a separate docket would result in significant redundancies and increased expenses for all parties, as much of the same information would need to be elicited and provided in each separate docket. The Commission's ability efficiently to analyze Montezuma's three financing applications and to set just and reasonable rates for Montezuma in the Rate Application docket would be hampered if the four dockets were not consolidated. Furthermore, no party's rights would be prejudiced by consolidation of the four dockets because the overriding issues of Montezuma's financial position and financial needs exist within each docket, and consolidation should decrease redundancies and administrative burdens. Thus, the four dockets will be consolidated.

The Commission is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing to consider a financing

1 2 3

See A.R.S. §§ 40-250(A), 40-302(A); A.A.C. R14-2-103(B).

application or to consider a rate application for a water utility smaller than a Class C.¹ However, the Commission, in its discretion, may hold an evidentiary hearing to consider any application, if it is believed that the public interest would be best served by holding an evidentiary hearing. Because an evidentiary hearing will provide the best opportunity for the facts to be established regarding Montezuma's financial position and financial needs, an evidentiary hearing will be required in this matter. However, it would be premature to establish a procedural schedule until such time as Staff determines that Montezuma's Rate Application and financing applications are sufficient.

Ms. Olsen's signature on each of the responses filed in the above-referenced dockets is understood to be an assertion by Montezuma that Ms. Olsen will serve as Montezuma's representative in these matters. If Montezuma intends instead to be represented before the Commission in these matters by an attorney or another individual eligible to represent Montezuma before the Commission as provided under Arizona Supreme Court Rule 31(d)(28), Montezuma shall file a Notice of Appearance for such individual.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Docket Numbers W-04254A-12-0204, W-04254A-12-0205, W-04254A-12-0206, and W-04254A-12-0207 are hereby consolidated.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that an evidentiary hearing shall be held in this consolidated matter, but will not be scheduled until after Staff has determined that Montezuma's Rate Application and financing applications are sufficient.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Montezuma intends to be represented before the Commission in these matters by an attorney or another individual eligible to represent Montezuma before the Commission as provided under Arizona Supreme Court Rule 31(d)(28), Montezuma shall file a Notice of Appearance for such individual.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **discovery** shall be as permitted by law and the rules and regulations of the Commission, except that any objection to discovery requests shall be made within 7 calendar days of receipt² and responses to discovery requests shall be made within 10 calendar days

The date of receipt of discovery requests is not counted as a calendar day, and requests received after 4:00 p.m. Arizona time will be considered as received the next business day.

. . .

of receipt. The response time may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties involved if the request requires an extensive compilation effort.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that for discovery requests, objections, and answers, if a receiving party requests service to be made electronically, and the sending party has the technical capability to provide service electronically, service to that party shall be made electronically.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties **shall** attempt to settle discovery disputes through informal, good-faith negotiations before seeking Commission resolution of the controversy.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in the alternative to filing a written motion to compel discovery, any party seeking resolution of a discovery dispute may telephonically contact the Commission's Hearing Division to request a date for a procedural conference to resolve the discovery dispute; that upon such a request, a procedural conference will be convened as soon as practicable; and that the party making such a request shall forthwith contact all other parties to advise them of the procedural conference date and shall at the procedural conference provide a statement confirming that the other parties were contacted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any motion, other than a Motion to Intervene, that is filed in this matter and that is not ruled upon within 20 calendar days of the filing date of the motion shall be deemed denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any response to a motion shall be filed within five calendar days of the filing date of the motion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any reply shall be filed within five calendar days of the filing date of the response.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties must comply with Arizona Supreme Court Rules 31 and 38 and A.R.S. § 40-243 with respect to the practice of law and admission *pro hac vice*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113—Unauthorized Communications) applies to this proceeding and shall remain in effect until the Commission's Decision in this matter is final and non-appealable.

1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge may rescind, alter, amend, or
2	waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at
3	hearing.
4	DATED this 24 day of July, 2012.
5	
6	Jana Harri
7	SARAH N. HARPRING
8	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
9	Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered
10	this 24th day of July, 2012 to:
11	Patricia Olsen MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER CO., LLC
12	P.O. Box 10 Rimrock, AZ 86335
13	John E. Dougherty, III
14	P.O. Box 501 Rimrock, AZ 86335
15	Janice Alward, Chief Counsel, Legal Division
16	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
17	Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2927
18	Steven Olea, Director, Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
19	1200 West Washington Street
20	Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2927
21	- A C
22	By: V V X 1/7 U L Debra Broyles
23	Secretary to Sarah N. Harpring
24	
25	
26	